IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P.No. 694/ /2001

PETITIONER : Bhuvneshwer Prasad Ratre
S/o Shri Bhakhlaram Ratre,
aged about 32 years,
Guruji at E.G.S. Center
Dudgha(Kosala) R/o Village-
Dudgha, Post- Bhadra, Tehsil-
Pamgarh, Distt. Janjgir Chanpa.

P.A. to Shri Rajesh Shastri
Presented on 5/10
dated 3-10-01

- Versus -

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh
through Secretary Department
of Panchayat Mantralaya,
Shastri Chowk, Raipur(C'garh).

2. Chief Executive Officer,
Janpad Panchayat Pamgarh
Pamgarh, Janjgir Chanpa.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION ETC. AND FOR FURTHER APPROPRIATE DIRECTIONS OF ORDERS.

77

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

S.B. : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.562 OF 2001

Petitioners	:	Shriram Khare and another
	versus	
Respondents	:	State of Chhattisgarh and another

WRIT PETITION NO.604 OF 2001

Petitioner	:	Bhuvneshwer Prasad Ratre
	versus	
Respondents	:	State of Chhattisgarh and another

WRIT PETITION NO.606 OF 2001

Petitioner	:	Reshamlal Yadav
	versus	
Respondents	:	State of Chhattisgarh and another

78

WRIT PETITION NO.607 OF 2001

Petitioner	:	Raj Kumar Patel
	versus	
Respondents	:	State of Chhattisgarh and another

Present : Mr. Vinay Pandey, counsel for the petitioners in all the four writ petitions.
Mr. Sushil Dubey, Government Advocate for respondent No.1/State in all the four writ petitions.
Mr. R.S.Marhas, counsel for respondent No.2/Chief Executive Officer in all the four writ petitions.

ORDER
(Passed on 29th of August, 2006)

Learned counsel for the parties, submit that Writ Petitions No.562/2001, 604/2001, 606/2001 and 607/2001 involve a common question of law and that of facts and pray for their disposal by a common order. Thus, all the four writ petitions are being disposed of by a common order passed hereunder :

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners in all the petitions were appointed as Gurujis for one academic session. Their services were discontinued after one year in some cases and earlier in some cases.

3. It appears that appointments of the petitioners as Gurujis were not in accordance with the Constitutional Scheme, even otherwise their appointment was for one academic session and as such, the petitioners have no right to continue in service or to be reappointed again in the next academic session.

4. It is further contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that similarly situated Gurujis have been considered by the concerned Collector and, on their being found fit, have been appointed as Shiksha Karmi Grade-III.

5. It is prayed for by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners be granted liberty to make representation to the concerned authority and the concerned authority be directed to consider cases of the petitioners for appointment as Shiksha Karmi Grade-III on their being found otherwise qualified and fit for appointment in accordance with law, to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection.

6. For the aforementioned reasons, all the four writ petitions are disposed of with the above-stated liberty. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge